



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/812,754

03/29/2004

Ying-Qing Xu

MS1-1894US

4802

22801 7590 10/16/2008
LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

PARK, EDWARD

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/16/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/812,754	Applicant(s) XU ET AL.	
	Examiner EDWARD PARK	Art Unit 2624	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) EDWARD PARK (Examiner). (3) Mr. Clay Hagler (#61,804).

(2) Yosef Kassa (Primary Examiner). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 08 October 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,27-29 and 35-41.

Identification of prior art discussed: Liang et al (IEEE, "Example Caricature Generation with Exaggeration"), Jaakkola et al (Proceedings of the 1999 Conference on AI and Statistics, "Probabilistic kernel regression models"), Massarsky (US 6,385,628 B1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative and examiner discussed the independent claim 1 in regards to the limitation of the kernel regression and also, the latter portion of claim 1. Furthermore, the 101 issue was discussed and concluded that the applicant's representative needed to revise the claim language in regards to claims 27-29, 35-41 to overcome the 101 rejection.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/YOSEF KASSA/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624	
--	--